

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

| • | | | ` | | |
|---|---------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
| 09/282,157 | 03/31/1999 | SAM E. KINNEY, JR. | 046700-5005 | 8245 | |
| 9629 75 | 90 09/23/2002 | | į. | | |
| MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP | | | EXAMINER | | |
| 1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW WASHINGTON, DC 20004 | | | BASHORE, ALAIN L | | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | 3624 | | | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 09/23/2002 | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| N. Carlotte | Application N . | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action | 09/282,157 | KINNEY, JR. ET AL. | | | | |
| Advisory Addon | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Alain L. Bashore | 3624 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communicati n appe | ears on the cover sheet with the c | correspondenc address | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 10 September 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a sinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | | | | | | |
| PERIOD FOR RE | EPLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | | |
| a) \boxtimes The period for reply expires $\underline{3}$ months from the mailing date | | | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension see have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension see under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if mely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. | | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be | ecause: | | | | | |
| (a) M they raise new issues that would require further | er consideration and/or search (| see NOTE below); | | | | |
| (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); | | | | | | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application is issues for appeal; and/or | n better form for appeal by mate | rially reducing or simplifying the | | | | |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceli | ing a corresponding number of f | inally rejected claims. | | | | |
| NOTE: <u>the viewing context now recited as being</u> 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti | | <u>ssue</u> . | | | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | be allowable if submitted in a se | eparate, timely filed amendment | | | | |
| 5.☐ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: | | idered but does NOT place the | | | | |
| The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | ause it is not directed SOLELY t | to issues which were newly | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we | • • • | | | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: 1-56, 67-60, and 71-75. | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | |
| 8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is | a) approved or b) disapp | roved by the Examiner. | | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen | nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | | | | | |
| 0.⊠ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> | | | | | | |
| | | Alain L. Bashore | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Continuation of 10.

Other:

IDS: The IDS filed with the after-final amendment does not contain the required certification and therefore fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.97(d). The IDS has been placed in the file but has not been considered.

The "prior art" designation requirement for the drawing figures: Applicant's specification describes drawing figures 1-4 in the background o the invention under "Traditional Procurement Models". Therefore, it must be made clear on the record as to whether these drawing figures constitute prior art. The statement "do not necessarily represent prior art" is considered unclear.